

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application.

The drawings are objected to for including elements that are not of sufficient quality such that all details are readily discernible. Specifically, the Office Action states that elements of FIGS. 2-4 appear solid black and it is difficult to discern boundaries between elements. FIGS. 1-8 are amended to remove the shading provided in the previous drawings. FIGS. 1-8 have simply been rendered as lined drawings to remove shading. Therefore no new matter has been added as a result of this amendment.

Claim 8 is objected to for including a typo. Claim 8 is amended to correct the typo and overcome the objection.

Claims 1-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent App. No. 2002/0136501 to Yen et al, hereinafter "Yen". Claim 1 is independent. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 provides an interface adaptor for an opto-electronic device. The interface adaptor includes a first portion for receiving an optical connector, a second portion for receiving an opto-electronic device, a third portion for connecting the first portion to the second portion, and a clip for securing the opto-electronic device to the interface adaptor. The second portion includes (a) a first aperture to receive the opto-electronic device within the second portion of the interface adaptor, and (b) a second aperture to receive the opto-electronic device. The first and second apertures include one or more projections located at the periphery of the apertures.

Yen discloses an assembly that includes a frame, a printed circuit board and an electrical connector (par. 0020). The frame 100 forms receptacles 110 and 120 at a first end, and an opening 160 at a second end of the frame (par. 0034). A first wall of the frame 100 defines recesses for partially receiving subassemblies connected to a printed

circuit board (pars. 0033, 0039).

Yen does not disclose a separate clip for securing an opto-electronic device to an interface adaptor. In contrast, claim 1 provides “a **clip** for securing the opto-electronic device to the interface adaptor.” The clip provided in claim 1, and shown for example in FIG. 2 of the specification, is a distinct component, separate from the projections included with the first and second apertures provided in claim 1, that acts to secure the opto-electronic device to the interface adaptor.

Yen does not disclose an interface adaptor for an opto-electronic device that includes “a clip for securing said opto-electronic device to said interface adaptor,” as recited in claim 1. Thus, Yen fails to disclose or suggest the elements of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Yen.

Claims 2-4 and 6 depend from claim 1. For at least reasoning similar to that provided in support of the patentability of claim 1, claims 2-4 and 6 are also patentable over Yen.

For the reasons set forth above, the rejection of claims 1-4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Yen is overcome. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-4 and 6 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 5, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yen in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,201,704 to Poplawski et al., hereinafter “Poplawski”. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As discussed above, Yen fails to disclose “a clip for securing said opto-electronic device to said interface adaptor,” as recited in claim 1. Thus, Yen fails to disclose or suggest the elements of claim 1.

Poplawski discloses an optoelectronic transceiver module having a main housing, at one end of which is attached a transceiver connector for receiving fiber optic plugs (col. 3, line 67 – col. 4, line 7). A male ribbon style connector protrudes from the housing (col. 4, lines 57-59). The housing consists of a potting box with potting material inserted therein (col. 2, lines 44-46). The potting box has a recess that allows an optical subassembly to extend outside of the potting box, and a recess cover may be provided for forming a liquid tight seal between the recess cover, the potting box, and the optical subassembly (col. 2, lines 48-53).

Poplawski fails to make up for the deficiencies of Yen, as they apply to claim 1. Specifically, Poplawski does not disclose “a clip for securing said opto-electronic device to said interface adaptor,” as recited in claim 1.

Thus, Yen and Poplawski, whether considered alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the elements of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over the cited combination of Yen and Poplawski.

Claims 5, 7 and 9 depend from claim 1. For at least reasoning similar to that provided in support of the patentability of claim 1, claims 5, 7 and 9 are also patentable over the cited combination of Yen and Poplawski.

For the reasons set forth above, the rejection of claims 5, 7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Yen in view of Poplawski is overcome. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 5, 7 and 9 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yen in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,796,726 to Nakura et al., hereinafter “Nakura”. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As discussed above, Yen fails to disclose or suggest the elements of claim 1.

Nakura discloses an optical connector wherein an element body portion of an optical element is fittingly received in a receiving recess formed in a connector housing (col. 1, lines 55-58). However, Nakura fails to make up for the deficiencies of Yen. Nakura does not disclose "a clip for securing said opto-electronic device to said interface adaptor," as recited in claim 1.

Thus, Yen and Nakura, whether considered alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the elements of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over the cited combination of Yen and Nakura.


Claim 8 depends from claim 1. For at least reasoning similar to that provided in support of the patentability of claim 1, claim 8 is also patentable over the cited combination of Yen and Nakura.

For the reasons set forth above, the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Yen in view of Nakura is overcome. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 8 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

An indication of the allowability of all pending claims by issuance of a Notice of Allowability is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/15/05



Paul D. Greeley  
Reg. No. 31,019  
Attorney for Applicant  
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, LLP  
One Landmark Square, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Stamford, CT 06901-2682  
Tel: (203) 327-4500  
Fax: (203) 327-6401

**IN THE DRAWINGS**

Please replace FIGS. 1-8 with the amended version included herewith.